

I want to call to everyone's attention two issues that are of vital concern that I think ought to be and must be part of the Senate agenda. The first is an issue dealing with the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty.

The Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty is something that has been before the Senate now for some long while. Efforts to achieve a nuclear test ban treaty originated with President Eisenhower. It has been around a long time. This President, after long negotiations through many administrations, finally signed the treaty. It has now been sent to the Senate for ratification. But it has languished in the Senate for 658 days, during which time there has not been even a hearing on the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty.

I will put up a couple of charts to describe the circumstances with this treaty.

The rule in the Senate requires that the Senate should consider treaties as soon as possible after their submission.

In fact, the Limited Nuclear Test Ban Treaty in 1963 was considered by the Senate in 3 weeks; SALT I, 3 months; the ABM Treaty, 10 weeks; ABM Treaty Protocols, 14 months; START I, 11 months.

We have had the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty before the Senate for 658 days with not even a hearing. I think that is a shame. This treaty ought to be part of this Senate's agenda. If we do not have a hearing and do not ratify this treaty by the end of September, we will have only a limited role when a conference is formed in October of the countries that have ratified this treaty to discuss its entry into force. It does not make any sense to me.

This country ought to lead on issues concerning the nonproliferation of nuclear weapons. One way to lead on those issues is to ratify the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. It does not make any sense for the treaty to have been signed, negotiated and sent to this Senate, and then to have it languish for all of these days.

I would like to put up a chart which shows a concern that some of the critics have. They say: Well, gosh, with all this Chinese espionage, the last thing we want, is to do something with respect to a treaty on banning nuclear tests.

The Cox report on the Chinese espionage makes references to the CTBT. The report says it will be more difficult for the Chinese to develop advanced nuclear weapons if we have this treaty in place. If the People's Republic of China violated the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty by testing surreptitiously to further accelerate its nuclear development, we could detect it given the monitoring system imposed by the treaty. If the Chinese are signatories to the treaty and the Russians are signatories to the treaty—and they are waiting for us—and we can stop testing, the only conceivable way they could validate any kind of nuclear stockpile is through the use of ad-

vanced computers. The restrictions imposed by the CTBT make it extremely difficult or impossible to improve nuclear weapons designs except by high performance computers.

The Cox report appears to make the point that it is more important for us to restrict the shipment of advanced computers to the Chinese. The point is this—we deserve an opportunity to debate the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty. We should have done so long ago. I don't mean to argue the merits of it on the floor today.

My hope is, we will not go through July as if this treaty doesn't exist. It was negotiated, signed, and has been before the Senate over 600 days. There hasn't been one hearing. There ought to be a hearing. It ought to be brought to the floor so the American people can, through this Senate, debate that treaty.

Finally, support for the nuclear test ban: 75 percent, 74 percent, 85 percent, 80 percent, these are national polls over time, always consistently high support for this kind of a treaty. This Congress has a responsibility. I say to my colleagues who really don't want to do this: You have a responsibility to the country to do this. I hope that in the month of July we can make progress in passing this Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to send a resolution to the desk.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE FARM CRISIS

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, let me turn to an additional issue I believe Congress and the President must consider in the month of July. It deals with the urgent farm crisis that exists in farm country across America.

If there was a massive earthquake, a series of tornadoes, fires, or floods across the Midwest, we would see Congress, the Federal Emergency Management Agency, virtually everyone involved through the Federal agencies responding immediately. The President would likely fly out and view it. Congress would send emergency help. Federal agents would be there en masse setting up offices to help.

Yet in farm country we have a crisis that is just as real, not as dangerous to human health or human life as a tornado or a flood, perhaps, but just as real and just as dramatic as natural disasters.

The chart here shows what has happened to the price of wheat since 1996. You can see what has happened to the price of wheat. We have mostly wheat farmers up in our part of the country. The price of wheat has collapsed like a lead weight. Ask yourself: If your income collapsed, if a Senator's income collapsed like that, do you think there would be howls of protest? Do you think that would be an emergency? How about the minimum wage, if it

went down like this? How about if the stock market looked like this? Do you think there would be a problem in this country? Of course, there would.

This is a huge problem in the farm belt. Family farmers are finding themselves on the precipice of going broke in record numbers. I had a call this morning from a family farmer who nearly choked up on the phone saying: I don't think my son and I can continue. We can't continue when prices have collapsed. We don't have the income to continue family farming.

For them it is a dream, a lifestyle, a way of life. It is not just a business.

This Congress, while prices have collapsed, largely is content to sort of meander around and talk as if it were theory. It is not theory. It is a crisis.

This chart shows what is happening across the farm belt. The red indicates the counties that have lost more than 10 percent of their population, 1980-1998. Take a look at the red. What does that show? The middle part of America is being depopulated, especially now with prices collapsing, people moving out and not in.

The question is, "What are we going to do about that?" Congress has a responsibility to do something about it and so does this President. This Congress passed the Freedom to Farm bill. The presumption of Freedom to Farm is, we will reduce support prices and you rely on the marketplace. If the marketplace has collapsed prices, there has to be a safety net. If you don't have a safety net, you won't have family farmers left.

Freedom to Farm hasn't worked, and this Congress needs to understand that and do something about it. The President also has a responsibility. He signed the Freedom to Farm bill. He complained a little about it when he signed it, but he signed it and said: We will make some improvements.

The Freedom to Farm bill hasn't worked. Our trade policies are bankrupt and not working. Concentration of agricultural industries means that farmers face monopolies in every direction. All of these combined together are conspiring to leave this country without family farmers in its future, and that will be, in my judgment, a massive failure for America.

In the month of July, in the coming 4 weeks, the President has a responsibility, in my judgment, to come to Congress with a bold approach in dealing with this issue. Congress has a responsibility to deal with it, as well, in a bold manner.

I know some in Congress say: We don't intend to do anything until the President sends us something. They didn't have that reticence about adding \$6 billion to the defense bill. When the emergency bill came up for defense, they said: We don't care what the President said. We think he should have \$6 billion more.

This is a joint responsibility. The Congress needs to act and the President needs to act. We need to do it together, and it needs to be done now.

Not later, now. If we don't take action soon, we won't have family farmers left. We won't have to worry about an emergency family farm bill because there won't be family farmers around to respond to.

Again, if there was an earthquake or a flood or fire or tornado or perhaps even some hog disease, as Will Rogers used to say, you'd have all the Federal agents coming out to talk about the hog disease. They would want to know, "what is happening here and will it spread to other hogs?"

One way to get attention, it seems to me, is for Congress and the President to decide that this is a farm crisis. It is in my part of the country, with the collapse in prices and the natural disaster that has kept about 3 million acres from being planted in North Dakota because it was too wet. The floods and the worst crop disease in this century, all piled on top of family farmers' shoulders at a time when prices are collapsed. To add to their burden, we have a trade agreement that allows the Europeans to spend 10 times as much on their farm program as we do and undercuts prices on sales to foreign governments. We let them do that in excess of ours—we won't even use our export program for reasons I don't understand—at a time of mounting burdens on family farmers in a way that is fundamentally unfair.

We had better decide as a country that family farming matters to our future. If we don't, they won't be around. When they are not around, corporations will farm our country coast to coast. The price of food will go up and this country will have lost something and every small town will have lost something important.

This is not just about farmers. It is about small towns and Main Streets and boarded-up business and economies that are empty shells in a lot of our small communities.

My message is very simple: We have a responsibility this month. We have a responsibility now, all of us, and so does the President, to have a meeting. I want the White House to have a meeting on this with Republicans and Democrats. I want us to come together with an emergency package that responds to the farm crisis, does it boldly, does it in a way that helps real family farmers, and does it in a way that gives family farmers some hope that their future is a future in which they can make a decent living raising America's food supply.

If I might make one additional point: We have to rely on foreign markets as well. We produce more food than we consume in this country. Yet I heard last week that the amount of imported food in this country has doubled in the last 7 years.

We had protests at the Canadian border last weekend. It is unfair the level of imports coming from Canada. The thing I don't understand, however, is the grain market, all these folks that worship at the altar of the marketplace

in the grain market. The grain market says to our farmers: Your food that you produce has no value. Yet all the testimony we hear from all around the world, Sudan included, tells us that old women are climbing trees foraging for leaves to eat because there is nothing to eat. We know that a substantial portion of the world's population goes to bed at night with an ache in their belly because of hunger.

It makes no sense for us to be told that our food has no value when people go to bed hungry each night. I want the White House and the Congress together to boldly respond to this issue in the coming weeks. This 4-week period is critical. We must put this on the agenda in a bipartisan way and do so boldly. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana is recognized.

THE AGRICULTURE CRISIS

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I commend the Senator from North Dakota for his statement. He is on target. He raises an issue that so far this Congress has not dealt with. It is as precipitous, as calamitous, as tragic, frankly, as the Senator indicated. I very much hope that Senators heard the statement of the Senator from North Dakota. I also hope the White House heard his statement, and others, too.

I do not know exactly what the answer is, but I do know we need an answer. We need a solution to the problems our farmers are facing because the conditions he described in North Dakota are the same conditions one would find in my State, particularly the eastern half, which produces a lot of grain and some barley. But it is a wheat-producing area that is experiencing very difficult conditions.

TEMPORARY TRADE RELIEF FOR THE U.S. LAMB INDUSTRY

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I want to acknowledge, and I very much appreciate, the action taken last week by the President in response to the recommendations of the International Trade Commission—otherwise known as the ITC—on relief for the American lamb industry. As you know, the industry has gone through very difficult times these last few years. Imports have surged dramatically and lamb prices have dropped precipitously. The package of trade relief and adjustment assistance announced by the President will help the industry adjust. It will allow our producers and feeders to keep their businesses and prosper in the future.

I am very grateful to the President and the staff of many agencies for their work on behalf of the American lamb industry and the American workers in that industry.

This was an important decision. Why? For several reasons. First, of course, it provides significant relief to the lamb industry, which is very im-

portant in my home State, as well as elsewhere in the Nation. Second, however, it demonstrates that section 201 of U.S. trade law can work. This is the so-called "safeguard provision." It is designed to prevent serious disruption to the domestic industry whenever there is an import surge.

Third, the decision was important because I hope it shows a renewed commitment by the Clinton administration to assist American industries. This includes the agriculture sector that faces unprecedented challenges in the U.S. market for reasons not of their own making.

Section 201 has been little used in recent years. Both Democratic and Republican administrations have been reluctant to aggressively apply its provisions. For example, in the mid-1980s President Reagan would not follow an ITC recommendation for trade relief for the American footwear industry.

That failure was a major contributor to the introduction of many legislative proposals that could have significantly closed the American market to foreign products. American industries and workers—whether in manufacturing, agriculture, or services—must think the Federal Government will use all available tools to help them when they are challenged suddenly by surges in imports. This is especially important today, when global financial disruption can change competitive positions of countries overnight.

In the case of lamb, we see an industry that has been severely damaged by imports. Without relief, the injury to the industry would have continued to worsen. The number of sheep being raised is at an all-time low. Prices have dropped precipitously. Lending institutions are increasingly unwilling to extend credit.

The industry did what it was supposed to do. It used the domestic legal process authorized by the WTO. That process is enforced through section 201 of the U.S. trade law. This is how the process should work and, in this case, is working.

I believe the reluctance of the executive branch over the past 15 years to take action under section 201 has been a serious mistake. The most recent example of this is the late action that was taken by the administration to deal with the surge of steel imports. The volume of steel imports now seems to be under control. But we are still faced with a dilemma. How can we ensure that the next time the steel sector, or any other sector, is threatened by a precipitous spike in imports, strong and rapid measures will be taken to provide relief to those industries?

Earlier this session, I introduced the Import Surge Relief Act. It would improve and expedite the way our Government deals with import surges. It would ease the standard that must be met to demonstrate that there is a causal link between imports and injury to an American industry. It would